
THE
ETRUSCAN QUESTION.

BY
PROF. G. D. FERGUSON,
Queen's University, Kingston.

THE ETRUSCAN QUESTION.

BY PROF. G. D. FERGUSON.

In January last, Professor Campbell, of the Presbyterian College, Montreal, read a paper before this Institute, in which he seeks to prove the affinity of the Etruscan with the Basque, and claims to have found the clue by which he is enabled to read the Etruscan inscriptions. It is an accepted principle that our only hope of deciphering and translating the inscriptions on the monuments of a nation that has passed away is by means of a bilingual inscription. It was in this way that the hieroglyphics of Egypt, and the cuneiform inscriptions have been read. Any other way than this must be hypothetical, and therefore unreliable, for, however ingeniously the researches may be conducted, we cannot accept the results with any confidence. Proceeding on this hypothetical principle it is quite possible, by a mere resemblance in the words, to show with great plausibility the affinity of a language, and consequently of a nation, with any other language or nation. We have not hitherto attached importance to Professor Campbell's researches. Any attention we may have given to comparative philology has been because of its historical importance, and, if Professor Campbell derived any satisfaction from his Hittite or Aztec researches, we were not disposed to detract from that pleasure, for neither the Hittites nor the Aztecs have contributed much to the general development of civilization, and historically considered are unimportant nations. The Hittites had relations with Egypt during the Hyksos period, and during the reign of Rameses II., but they did not affect to any extent the progress of civilization. But Professor Campbell was treading very different ground when he entered the field of Etruscan research. The Etruscans were a very important people. They at one time occupied the greater part of the Italian peninsula, and largely influenced Roman civilization. They had extensive commercial relations with the inland countries of Europe, and with the Baltic.

They have been regarded as foreigners on Italian soil, and there has been a very strong desire to read their numerous inscriptions, and to trace their affinity with other nations. It is more than half a century since Niebuhr said that he would willingly give half of what he possessed, if he could possibly obtain a clue to the deciphering of the Etruscan language, but he had come to look on this as utterly hopeless. Undoubtedly since Niebuhr's day some advance has been made in our knowledge of the Etruscan language. In 1828 appeared the first edition of Ottfried Müller's "*Die Etrusker*," and in the second volume of this very learned work the author established the value and power of both the Etruscan and the Umbrian letters. Five years after, in 1833, appeared Lepsius' work, "*De Tabulis Eugubinis*," in which he substantiated the results arrived at by Müller. The subsequent researches of Aufrecht and Kirchhoff, of Grotefend and Lassen, of Mommsen and Deecke, of Corssen and Pauli, of Curtius and Bugge, with those of English, French, Italian, and Swedish scholars, have all tended to support the results arrived at by Müller and Lepsius, till in the last edition of Müller's work, edited by Deecke, we have a very valuable supplement, in which there is very clearly and satisfactorily represented, not only the value of the Etruscan letters, but the changes of which they are susceptible, their possible combinations, the laws of syncope, of *inlaut* and *auslaut*, of *anlaut* and *ablaut*, in fact a thorough treatise on the subject.

Prof. Campbell ignores the results arrived at by these scholars, whose names are a sufficient guarantee of the conscientiousness of their labours, of their industry and judgment, their extensive learning, and their sincere love of the truth. Lepsius was perhaps better versed than any other in Egyptian writing, and his researches are marked by striking calmness and judgment. Grotefend and Lassen devoted themselves with equal success to the study of the cuneiform inscriptions. Kirchhoff and Aufrecht have thrown a flood of light on the old Italian dialects. Mommsen is our greatest authority on Roman history and Roman epigraphy. Why has Prof. Campbell ignored the works of all these eminent scholars? He once quotes from Deecke, but it is from that rather meagre article which Deecke contributed to the *Encyclopedia Britannica*—an article scarcely in keeping with Deecke's erudition. These earnest students were obliged to confess their inability to translate the Etruscan inscriptions, or to establish the affinity of the Etruscan language. But

where these men, who spent their lives in such studies, failed, Prof. Campbell claims a complete victory. He enters the field, and waves his magic wand, and all is done; the old Etruscan starts again into life, and gives up its long impenetrable secrets. "Etruria capta est," and he declares: "I have the honour to report to this Institute, as one of the most important results of my studies in Hittite Palæography, the solution of the Etruscan problem." Perhaps we are unfitted for criticising this last wonderful achievement, as we had attached no importance to the results which Prof. Campbell imagined he had reached in regard to other languages, but we were long at a loss to understand, even from his own point of view, what possible connection there could be between Hittite Palæography and this Etruscan problem. But this present contribution is only a part of a great "Etruria Capta." He promises a fuller work in which he will offer a translation of the Eugubine Tables. We quote his words: "Of these Tables, seven only and a part of the eighth are in the Etruscan character, the rest are written in the Roman alphabet, and are in Umbrian. These Umbrian Tables are being translated and will be shortly presented to the world as the oldest Celtic documents." Umbrian Celtic? As well tell us that English is Japanese or Choctaw. But in this promised translation of the Eugubine Tables, will Prof. Campbell kindly begin with the eighth. We have to inform him that there are not more than seven of these Eugubine Tables, and they are all in Umbrian, though five are in the Etruscan characters, and two in the Latin. The Etruscan Tables are much older than the Latin, and they prove the early extended influence of the Etruscans, and the prevalence of their alphabet. But when in 307 B.C. the Umbrians became subject to the Romans, they adopted the Roman customs and the Roman alphabet, and so the acts and the ritual of the College of Priests, which had been previously in the Etruscan alphabet, were transliterated into Latin.

Prof. Campbell has imagined that Etruscan may be Basque, and he resolves to prove it Basque. He is not the first who has imagined this. Some fifty years ago, Sir Wm. Bethran wrote some articles in "Les Annales de Philosophie Chrétienne," having for their object to prove the identity of the Basque and Etruscan. Scholars did not even condescend to review his absurd hypothesis. The only notice we believe the work ever received was in this form, "Cette assertion

gratuite ne mérite pas de réfutation." Mr. Ellis, in one of his posthumous works, proposes the same hypothesis.

Prof. Campbell, however, approaches the subject from a different point of view—from the supposed syllabic character of the Etruscan. But he never attempts to prove this syllabic character, he merely supposes it to be syllabic, and proceeds to prove its affinity with the Basque. Now there is a very great number of Etruscan inscriptions found, from Capua in the South up in to the Alps in the North. They are for the most part monumental inscriptions, and are therefore short. Many of them are bilingual—Latin and Etruscan, and it is reasonable to suppose, judging from other bilinguals, that the one will be a literal translation or reproduction of the other. Unfortunately these monumental inscriptions consist largely of proper names, and can aid us little in gaining a knowledge of the language; but there is this advantage which proper names present, and that is, that they will enable us to determine the character and value of the letters, and some of the grammatical forms; and it is just this advantage which has enabled Lepsius and Deecke to determine so exactly the value and power of the letters, and to study the laws, which apparently govern their relations, without however gaining any fuller knowledge of the language. But besides these bilingual inscriptions there are in the writings of Greek and Roman authors some forty or fifty Etruscan words, transliterated into Latin characters. So far as these words go, they are important, and yet they do not throw much light on the construction of the language, and they form a very meagre vocabulary; but this one thing they do, they confirm the bilingual inscriptions in establishing the character of the letters. As this is the point which Prof. Campbell pooh-poohs, it will be necessary to consider it for a little, and we shall take one or two examples of bilingual inscriptions:

V · LECNE V · PAPIRINAL

VEL · LICINIUS VEL · PAPIRI NATUS.

Now are we wrong in supposing that V of the first line corresponds with V of the second line, and the L of the first with the L of the second, and the whole of the word Papiri of the first with the word Papiri of the second? But before *n* in Etruscan the preceding vowel is always syncopated—the Latin Capena is the Etruscan Capna, the Latin Marcanius the Etruscan Marcna, and so Menelaus = Menle,

Herakles = Herkle, and here the Latin Licinius is the Etruscan Leene; the *i* and *e* being often interchanged. The suffix AL is a masculine genitive termination, and is of constant occurrence in the monumental inscriptions, as Arnthal of Arnth, Larthal of Larth, or son of Larth; just as in Latin we say Marcus Tullii, Marcus the son of Tullius, and the Papirinal of the above inscription is rendered in Latin Papiri natus, and the whole inscription reads, Velleius Licinius, the son of Velleius Papirus. While *al* is the masculine suffix, the corresponding feminine suffix is *-alisa*, and we have this inscription, where both the father's and mother's names are given:

LARIS FRAUCNE VELUSA LATINIALISA.

LARIS FRAUCNE the son of VELUSE and LATINIA.

Similar inscriptions are very common, and a number may be found in Prof. Campbell's *Etruria Capta*. But the Eugubine Tables, being principally in the form of rituals, present several formulæ which occur in the Tables of the Etruscan, and also of the Latin or Umbrian character. Compare the following formulæ as they occur in the Etruscan characters of the first Table, and in the Latin characters of the sixth Table:

ETR.—Vukukum : iuviu : pune : uvef : furfath : tref : vitluf : turuf : marte :
hurce :

LAT.—Vocucum · iuviu · punne · ovi · furfant · vitlu · toru · trif · fetu · marte ·
horse ·

fetu : pupluper : tutas : iuvinas : tutaper : ikuvina : vatuva : ferine :
fetu :

fetu · popluper · totar · iiovinar · totaper · iioovina · vatua · ferine · fetu ·
puni : fetu : arvia :

puni · fetu · arvia ·

And again a little below in the same Tables :

ETR.—Vukukum : kureties : tref : vitlup : turup : hunte : feitu : pupluper :
tutas :

LAT.—Vocucum · corecier · vitlu · toru · trif · fetu · honde · fetu · popluper ·
totar ·

iuvinas : tutaper : iioovina : vatuva : ferine : fetu : arvia :

iiovinar · totaper · iiovinar · vatve · ferine · fetu · arvio ·

It would seem impossible to doubt that in these instances we have a simple transliteration, and that the formulæ written in the Etruscan characters are literally reproduced in the Latin characters; and if so, then they establish the value of the Etruscan letters. This would

seem almost self-evident, and no one has for one moment doubted it, till Prof. Campbell propounds his hypotheses. Believing that he has solved all other linguistic problems, of the Horites and Hittites, of the Japanese and Aztecs, of the Cyprians and Choctaws, he believes it his duty also to untie the Etruscan knot. He ridicules all these bilingual similarities, and marks out a certainly original mode of dealing with the subject. He has resolved that Etruscan is Basque, and Basque he intends to prove it, and all difficulties must give way before this hypothesis. But in choosing the Basque with which he is to prove the affinity of the Etruscan, we think Prof. Campbell has been very unfortunate. The Basques are a small body of people living on the Spanish and French slopes of the Pyrenees. They number about 700,000, and are the descendants of the old Vascons. They have never played an important part in history, and have contributed nothing to the general development of civilization. They show some affinity with some of the native tribes of North Africa, but perhaps more with the inhabitants of the American continent. We know that at one time Africa was joined to Europe at the Straits of Gibraltar, and there is every probability that in the Miocene period Europe was connected with America, and the people of America may have crossed over by a great Atlantic bridge, having left however a small remnant in Spain. But, whatever the affinity of the Basques, they have, from a very early period, been largely affected by foreign influences. No part of Europe has so changed masters as Spain. Phœnicians, Celts, Greeks, Carthaginians, Romans, Visigoths, Alans, Moors, and the Romance nations have at one time or other held Spain, and have influenced the Basques, and these at the present day present physiological characteristics so diversified as to baffle all attempts at ethnological classification; and the Basque language is perhaps the most corrupt of all languages. The writer of the article on the Basques, in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, a work Prof. Campbell is fond of consulting, says: "Foreign words are easily assimilated, but with modifications to suit the Basque ear." If Prof. Campbell was resolved on proving the affinity of the Etruscans with the Basques, he ought to have positively assured himself, that in using individual words, it was really in each case a Basque word of which he had got hold; for to prove the affinity of the Basque and Etruscan by means of Greek or Latin, Gothic or Romance words, however perfectly incorporated into the Basque, would be an

absurdity; and we shall presently show that this is one of the absurdities in which Prof. Campbell has rather freely indulged.

But there is another difficulty. The Etruscan inscriptions are perhaps none of them later than the second century B.C., but the earliest examples of Basque literature are of the fifteenth century, except a short charter granted to the commune of Daviles in 1150.* Now under any circumstances there must be great difficulty in proving the affinity of languages whose literatures are separated by not less than seventeen centuries, but the difficulty becomes insuperable when it is remembered that one of the languages has been subjected to very great foreign influences. We quote from M. Blabé, the greatest authority on the Basque:—"L'idiome Basque s'est tellement modifié depuis le XVⁱème siècle-qu'il est toujours très difficile, quand il n'est pas absolument impossible, d'expliquer les premières textes connus qui remontent à cette époque." If the changes have been so great within three centuries, during which time the language has acquired, we should suppose, some degree of fixity through a printed literature, and when it has been comparatively free from foreign influence, what changes must have taken place in the seven centuries when the country was constantly changing masters, and there was no literature to fix the language. M. Blabé points out that it is impossible, just on account of the mixed character of the language and of the people, to determine the affinity of the Basques or of their language. After a lengthened review of all the sources of information, he says:—"La toponymie ancienne de l'Espagne, la numismatique dite ibérienne, le droit coutumier, et les prétendus chants héroïques, ne jettent donc, jusqu'au présent, aucune lumière sur l'origine des Basques. Les moyens d'information sont limités à l'histoire positive, à l'anthropologie, et à la philologie comparée. Ces trois sciences constatent unanimement que les Basques sont un peuple fort mélangé." M. Blabé plainly points out the great difficulty in determining the

* We are aware that there are two short poems, the *Chant des Cantabres*, and the *Chant d'Annibal*, which claim to have been written at a very early period. The *Chant des Cantabres* claims to have been written in the reign of Augustus, and to commemorate his campaign in the country of the Cantabri. It is rejected for the following reasons:—(1). No original manuscript has been found, but only what purports to be a copy of the original manuscript published in 1817. (2). It is full of anachronisms, it uses Latin terms only found in the Latin of the Later Empire or the Middle Ages. (3). It calls the Cantabri *Bizcayans*, but this term was not used earlier than the fifteenth century. Much the same criticism may be applied to the *Chant d'Annibal*.

affinity of the Basques themselves. The undecided relations of the Basques and of their language has hitherto deterred Etruscologists, and would naturally deter any ordinary scholar; but Prof. Campbell's ingenuity can adapt itself to the most adverse circumstances, and perhaps we should be more correct in saying that he is quite unconscious of these difficulties. But he has not only determined that Etruscan is Basque, but also that it is syllabic, and therefore he has found it necessary to reject all the bilinguals. "The bilingual inscriptions," he says, "present many difficulties. In some cases I doubt their being bilinguals at all, as the Etruscans used characters hardly differing from the Latin." Prof. Campbell is evidently ignorant of the relation between the Etruscan and Latin alphabets. We shall presently tell him something about this relation, but in the meantime does he not see that the existence of even only one bilingual inscription is sufficient to give us the characters of the letters? How many Rosetta stones, or how many Behistun inscriptions, would Prof. Campbell wish? The very scant inscription on the boss of Tarkondemos, consisting of only seven words, in the bilingual of Hittite and Persian cuneiform, has afforded Prof. Sayce a key by which he has been able not only to determine the value of the letters, but even to read some of the Hittite inscriptions. Prof. Campbell, if consistent, must reject all the bilingual inscriptions. But these Etruscan bilinguals present many difficulties to Prof. Campbell, simply because they will not fall in with his hypothesis. He believes that Basque is Turanian, and as he has determined that Etruscan is Basque, it must therefore be Turanian also. But he imagines that the Turanian languages are syllabic, and he concludes that as Etruscan is Turanian, it must also be syllabic, and now we begin to catch some idea of his meaning when he says:—"I have the honour to report to this Institute, as one of the most important results of my studies in Hittite Palæography, the solution of the Etruscan problem." The Hittite is Turanian and syllabic; the Etruscan he has determined is also Turanian, and therefore syllabic. There can then be no doubt as to the light which his studies in Hittite Palæography throw on the Etruscan problem. Let us satisfy ourselves of Prof. Campbell's reasoning: Etruscan is Basque, Basque is Turanian, Turanian languages are syllabic, therefore Etruscan is syllabic also. We are not responsible for Prof. Campbell's logic, we have only tried to reduce it to the simplest terms; but to himself nothing can be clearer, and all that is necessary is to illustrate it by examples, and applying this

key, he imagines that he can unlock all the treasures of the Etruscan language. All those bilingual inscriptions are of no value, nay they are deceptive, no doubt intentionally so, possibly to perplex such men as Müller and Lepsius, Mommsen and Deecke. If we are not to accept these bilingual inscriptions as virtually duplicates, then we cannot divine their meaning. In every other case bilingual inscriptions have been of the utmost value, have been indispensable, and we cannot understand why they should be worthless here. Prof. Campbell has however decided that they are worthless, and that the door will only open to his key. Now the whole value of Prof. Campbell's researches rests on the syllabic character of the Etruscan language; but we beg to differ from him, and we maintain that Etruscan is not syllabic. But admitting with Prof. Campbell that these bilinguals are worthless, yet apart from these, apart also from the fact that we know the history of the Etruscan alphabet better perhaps than we know the history of any other alphabet, we maintain that every circumstance is against the possibility of the Etruscan being syllabic. Prof. Campbell seems ignorant of the life and growth of languages, or at least of linguistic symbols. Languages pass through separate and distinct stages in regard to the character and value of the signs or symbols of thought. The first of these stages is the Ideographic, or, as it is generally called, the Hieroglyphic. A man in his barbarous state wishes to express his idea of a horse, and he draws the picture of a horse; of a man, and he draws the picture of a man. This is the earliest form in which man has expressed his ideas, whether for the purpose of communicating those ideas to others, or of preserving them, and assisting his own memory. This figurative writing is presented in the inscriptions of Egypt and of Mexico. But this is an exceedingly cumbersome mode of expressing ideas. An almost unlimited number of separate signs would be required. This would be most burdensome to the memory, and be unable to express grammatical relations. With the growth of ideas one sign came to express several ideas by means of determinates, or small distinguishing marks added to the sign itself, somewhat similar to the vowel signs in Hebrew; but there was a tendency in these original types of figurative writing to become conventional, as in the case of Chinese and the language of the cuneiform inscriptions. Here the signs do not at once suggest what they are intended to represent. They have undoubtedly grown out of iconographic prototypes, but they have lost their resemblance. They are called semeiographs, or

better ideograms. Now these ideograms mark a progress from purely figurative writing to phonetics. Thought and feeling naturally express themselves in voice, and a phonetic value came to be attached to the ideogram, and the sign suggested at once an object and a phonetic value. But the representative value of these signs became less and less prominent, and in time they were used only to express a sound or combinations of sounds. The name of the object represented a certain sound, at first no doubt the whole name, and then only a part of the name. And in this way arose syllabic writing, which was generally acrological, that is, the initial letter or letters came to express the sound which was itself expressive of an idea. In the case of the Chinese the ideogram has continued to express only one sound, and not a combination of sounds, and so the language has remained monosyllabic. The sacred books of the Chinese were however accepted by the Japanese, who adopted the characters in which the sacred books were written, but they ascribed to these characters a different phonetic value, while they combined them according to the exigencies of their own national idiom, and to permit of certain flexions. But this change, as exemplified in the Japanese or similar instances, marks a change from the ideogrammatic to the syllabic form. But the combination of signs permitted by the syllable allowed a great diminution in the number of the signs. In place of the innumerable signs of the Chinese, the Japanese expressed their vocalization by forty-seven characters wholly borrowed from the Chinese, but having different determinate values. This change of the value of the Chinese characters to the Japanese took place probably in the third century, but some five hundred years after, the connection of Japan with India led to the formation of a new syllabary, based on the other, but presenting a more cursive form, and reducing the number of syllabic signs. This syllabic state of a language marks a distinct stage in the growth of language, or rather of linguistic symbols. But there is still another stage in which individual signs are used to represent individual sounds, as they are uttered by the organs of speech; and now there is possible a classification of sounds, and consequently of letters into vowels and consonants, or into dentals, labials, gutturals, and nasals, and an alphabet is formed. Now this throughout is a gradual development. The figurative writing of the Egyptians was developed into the alphabet of the Phœnicians. The conventional figurative writing of the Chinese was developed into the syllabic of the Japanese, and

from that into the alphabet of the Coreans. The writing of the Accadians was developed into the cuneiform character of the Assyrians and the Babylonians, and from this passed, on the one hand into the syllabic cuneiform of the Persians, and of the Cyprians on the other. What we wish especially to point out is, that these changes mark distinct stages in linguistic development, and consequently in the development of civilization, for the two are inseparably connected. But Prof. Campbell imagines that the syllabic form is peculiar to the Turanian languages. That we may not misrepresent him we shall quote his own words. He says:—"The problem therefore is to find the powers of the Turanian alphabet or *syllabary*, Besides the Cypriote, the Corean of far Eastern Asia has furnished me with phonetic values of forms belonging to the Etruscan and other old *Turanian syllabaries*." Again:—"As the syllabic values of the Aztec characters are well known, I gained in them the actual key to the old *Turanian syllabaries*." With only a passing allusion to the absurdity of connecting the Aztec characters with the Cypriote, we wish to lay especial stress on Prof. Campbell's association of syllabism with the Turanian languages. On the other hand we would express our entire divergence from him, and we maintain that syllabism is a stage of linguistic development common to the Semitic and the Aryan with the Turanian languages. Take Persian as a type of the Aryan; Egyptian, or Assyrian, or Babylonian of the Semitic, as well as Japanese of the Turanian. It is quite true that very many of the Turanian languages at the present day are syllabic. The Japanese have only now reached that stage of development in which they find the syllabary inadequate to their growing requirements, and are adopting the alphabet of the European nations. But we repeat that syllabism is not peculiar to any one class of languages; it marks a stage in linguistic development. However, Prof. Campbell has determined that Etruscan is Turanian, and therefore syllabic. This is the result of his researches in Hittite Palæography, and cannot be doubted, and he sets about forming an Etruscan syllabary. But here a new difficulty meets him in the small number of the Etruscan signs. Simple letters may enter into an almost unlimited number of combinations, but syllables are not so flexible, will not so easily combine, and we require a very much larger number of syllabic signs. Thus the Amharic has thirty-three consonantal signs, each of which may combine with seven vowel signs, and a separate sign is used to denote each of these combinations, so that in the full

Amharic syllabarium there are two hundred and thirty-one different signs. The Persian, though approaching very closely the alphabetic form, has thirty-six distinct characters. But Etruscan has only twenty signs. Here too Prof. Campbell's ingenuity does not fail him, and he makes his syllabic signs mean anything, thus:—

I = ha he hi ho hu au ou eu oi o u hau.

II = ta te ti da de di at et it ad ed id.

K = os ots oz otz us uts tu uz utz hatz hitz hez hots huts.

L = so sa su za zo zu as oz, sometimes es ez, also it may denote cho chu cha, and ja jo ju.

In other words, the Etruscan syllabic signs represent in each case nearly all the vowel sounds in combination with a large number of consonants, so that we may make anything we please of these syllabic signs. Prof. Campbell acknowledges this, for he says:— "The poverty of the Etruscan syllabary multiplies the equivocal to such an extent that the context, or even a knowledge of the nature of the document in which the words occur, must decide their value."

The signs of this syllabary may mean anything we may choose to make them mean, only we must know beforehand what we expect them to say before we can make them say it. This is certainly very accommodating, but has it not struck Prof. Campbell that it is an insuperable difficulty in the way of receiving his hypothesis? But his syllabary of such a low order is inconsistent, not only with the evident laws of linguistic growth, but with the known facts of Etruscan civilization. The Etruscans had reached a high degree of civilization. At an early period, long before the date of the earliest of these inscriptions, the Etruscans were in close relations, commercial and otherwise, with two of the most civilized nations of the ancient world, the Greeks and the Carthaginians, and among whom the Alphabet had reached the fullest development. It is inconceivable,—it is wholly inconsistent with what we know of linguistic development, that the Etruscans should, alone of these nations, have remained in the syllabic stage, that while in every other respect they should have been noted for their civilization,—a civilization to which every museum in Europe bears evidence, that yet in their language they should have belonged to a past epoch. In a work of William Humboldt, "*Über die Verschiedenheit des Menschlichen Sprachbaues, und ihren Einfluss auf die geistige Entwicklung des Menschengeschlechtes*," there are such expressions as this: "There is a mutual

action of language on the mind and intelligence of a people, and of the mind and intelligence on the language. This is a capital fact. The mind of a nation, and the character of its language are so intimately bound up together, that, if the one is given, the other may be exactly deduced from it." We hold it impossible that a nation which was in a degree of equality with the Greeks,—a nation from which the Romans borrowed some of the most prominent features of their civilization, should have made no advance in their language beyond the syllabic state. But suppose we admit Prof. Campbell's assertion, let us see what he makes of it. We have already stated that there are some forty or fifty words occurring in Greek and Latin authors, and written in Greek and Latin characters. These words, however, he treats as literal or alphabetic; but it happens that some of these words occur in the inscriptions, and here he treats them as syllabic. But so elastic in his mode of procedure that both alike are made to serve his purpose. He says: "Of the Etruscan words furnished by classical authors, many at once reveal their Basque origin. Lar or Lars, as Lars Porsena is the Basque *larri*—Great." This titular prenominal appears to have been one of the most common among the Etruscans, as: Lars Porsena, Lars Tolumnius, Lars Herminius. Now when it is found in Greek or Latin writers it is allowed to retain its literal form, but when it occurs in the inscriptions it is syllabic, and is read *Saratuka*, and means "engraved." It occurs in an abbreviated form at page 34 of "*Etruria Capta*," and again at page 29, in the feminine. But is difficult to imagine how the same word can be at one time alphabetic and at another syllabic. This *Lars* as it occurs as a titular prenominal means *great*, no doubt in the sense of famous; just as we say Charles the Great, or Peter the Great, or Frederick the Great. Unfortunately we can find no such meaning given to *larri* in our Basque Dictionary. Here it is defined as "*un peu gros*,"—somewhat gross, or rather perhaps fat. Not as if it were Charles the Great but Charles the Fat, Charles le Gros,—whom the Germans called "*Karl der Dicke*." It is great in the Falstaffian sense. We doubt whether Prof. Campbell will be willing to accept this rendering. But in our Dictionary *larri* stands in a very suspicious connection, and has a very Romance look. It occurs as follows:—*Largo*, *élargir*; *Laranzo*, *lurgesse*; *Largo*, *large*; *Larri*, *un peu gros*. It is evidently a Romance word accepted by the Basque, and therefore cannot be used in tracing the affinity of the Etruscan with the Basque. Let us take another example of Prof. Campbell's translations:

Etr.—F. LEONE, F. OA/1PNAL.

Lat.—C. Licinii. C. F. Nigri.

Translit.—*Age* Sanesikane *age* morabautukarasa.

Basque, —*Age* Zunt-gikin *age* Maira Baitu sortze.

We shall not occupy time with minor criticisms, but "*age*" does not mean "to behold"; the proper word for behold is "*icust*." But Prof. Campbell says, "The Latin Licinii is a derivative from *licium*, a leash, a tag, a thread. It corresponds exactly with the Basque *zunft*, a needleful. The final *kane* represents *egin*, to do; Zuntze gin may be an old name for tailor or weaver. The other proper name translated Nigri is Maira, a Moor or person of dark complexion. The Etruscan adds Baitu, the spotted, from *bai*, a spot, as the mother of Maira. In Latin her name would probably be read as Varia." This is a very partial instance of the playfulness of Prof. Campbell's fancy. What possible connection can there be between *Licium* and *Licinii*? *Licinius* was one of the most common of the Roman Gentile cognomens. It especially occurs in the Gens of the Fabii, who had other connections with Etruria than the disaster at Veii. But the *Licinian* Gens, though of plebeian origin, was very influential. It is generally regarded as having come from Etruria, and when C. *Licinius Calvus* was consul in 364 B.C., mindful of his Etruscan origin, he secured the admission of Etruscan youths to the Roman games. The name occurs very often in Etruria, but also in Latium; at Tusculum we have the *Porcii Licinii*, and at Lanuvium the *Murenæ Licinii*. The form *Lecne*, and also the feminine *Lecnesa*, are very often met with on the Etruscan monuments. *Licinius* is simply the latinizing of *Lecne*, and has nothing whatever to do with *licium*, and still less with the Basque *Zunft*. But in this inscription occurs the word, or rather terminal, *nal*. No form occurs so frequently in these inscriptions as this. In the bilinguals it is invariably rendered by the Latin *natus* or *filius*. Now, the uniformity of this rendering evidently occasioned some difficulty to Prof. Campbell, and his object is to work in some word which will preserve this signification; according to his syllabarium, "*nal*" reads "*karasa*," and he says this represents the Basque "*sortze*". Now, as Prof. Campbell evidently attributes much importance to these words, and seems to regard "*karasa*" and "*sortze*" as test words, going far to show the connection between Etruscan and Basque, and as his reasoning here presents

a very good example of his reasoning in general, at the risk of being a little tedious, we shall examine it, and shall give his own words. He says, "The Rev. Isaac Taylor and other Etruscologists, while failing to translate these inscriptions, have made some good guesses. Such are their suppositions that the characters they have read *isa* denotè a wife, those read *sec* a daughter, those read *al* a child. The first is read *nare* or *anre*, a wife; the second, *nechi* or *nesca*; and the third, *karasa*; in modern Basque, *sortze*, *natus*." Surely Prof. Campbell must be aware that modern Basque can have no bearing on the present question; he might as well try to prove the affinity of the Japanese with the old Gauls by means of the present French. However, he proceeds at some length to justify the relation of these two words *karasa* and *sortze*. He says, "It has been objected that *karasa* and *sortze* are difficult to reconcile; that *nal*, *karasa* means *natus*, several bilinguals attest." Prof. Campbell's consistency is very wonderful. "The Basque 'natus' is *sortze*. The only difficulty in the words is the replacement of *ka* by *so*, after an interval of over one thousand years in the history of the language." We must plead inability to understand Prof. Campbell, but so far as we can make out, he means that one thousand years ago the *so* of *sortze* was *ka*; and that within the last thousand years it has undergone a change, and *kartze* has become *sortze*. What proof can Prof. Campbell adduce of this? How does he know that a thousand years ago *sortze* was *kartze*, when he has no document with which to compare it older than four hundred years ago? He refers to Van Eys's "Tableau des permutations des consonnes dans les mots Basques des différents dialectes." We fail to see what this reference has to do with the question. Van Eys is alluding to the large number of the Basque dialects, and he tabulates these dialects as they at present exist, but this has nothing to do with the historical changes which have taken place in the language, or with its analogies with other languages any more than a comparison of the dialect of Yorkshire with that of Lancashire, or with the London cockney has to do with the old Celtic of the earlier Britons. But Prof. Campbell regards the words *karasa* and *sortze* as so important that he illustrates their relation to one another by their supposed common affinity to the Japanese. He says the Japanese equivalent of the Basque *sortze* is *haruma*. This is very learned, and we feel our inability to follow

Prof. Campbell; fortunately, it is not necessary. We suppose he will not require to be told that the nearest neighbours of the Basques on the north are the Provençal, a people speaking a Romance dialect. But if Prof. Campbell will turn to a Romance Dictionary he will find this word *sortze* not even changed, as the writer in the Encyclopædia says, "to suit the Basque ear"; or, better still, if he will turn to Diez's Dictionary of the Romance languages, he will find there *sortze* with all its Romance affinities; it is a derivative from the Latin *surgere*. This word is not Basque; it is a Romance word so lately introduced into the Basque, that it is as yet unchanged, and the very learned disquisition about its being *kartze* a thousand years ago, and about its affinity with the Japanese *harama* is all thrown away upon us, and we still doubt the Etruscan being syllabic or that it has any connection with the Basque.

But further, on page 27 of "Etruria Capta" occur these words *Rakora* translated "offering," and in each of the next three inscriptions occurs the word *Rako*; so that on the same page *Rakora* occurs once, and *Rako* three times, and on all these occasions it is a noun and means an offering. These words occur very frequently in "Etruria Capta." So also do *Ra* and *Rano*, and at page 69 occurs *Rapi*, a verb, "to receive," and at page 98 we read "*Rako atso Rakone*," translated "towards age acknowledging,"—and regarding *Rakone* Prof. Campbell says: "The final *ne* seems to change the postposition *rako* into a verb,"—rather a unique grammatical change, we think unparalleled in the history of language, and surely he forgets that he has all along translated *Rako* as a noun and not as a postposition. He continues: "Here *Rakone* seems to signify "acknowledging," "paying respect to." We very much wonder, that with Prof. Campbell's profound knowledge of Basque, he has not discovered that in Basque no word begins with R. When we began to read Basque "Etruria Capta" we were rather surprised at frequently meeting with words beginning with R, and to find even allusions to them in the notes without any apparent consciousness of their irregularity; we turned over page after page of Basque to find a word beginning with R, but without success. We again consulted our Dictionary, and under the heading R we found the following: "Cette lettre R n'est en usage, au commencement des mots Basques, que pour les noms propres tels que Rome, Rambouillet, et encore dans le langage familier, les Basques diront Erroma, et non Roma. Il est à croire que la suppression de la

consonne R comme initiale des mots a pour cause certaines difficultés que son articulation semble offrir d'abord." Humboldt says: "No word in Basque commences with R. The Basques always place an *e* before foreign words of this category, and then double the R. And in certain cases, as in the words *edastea* and *erastea*, there is a dialectic change of *d* and *r*. But they always say *erregue*—roi." M. Blabé, the most competent authority, says: "Je conviens que le Basque n'a point en propre de mots commençants par *r* et que lorsqu'il donne l'hospitalité dans son glossaire a des mots ou *r* est en tête, il a soin de les faire précéder d'une voyelle. Sur le versant Nord des Pyrénées occidentales cette voyelle est un *a*—*arraya* la race, *arrichina* resine. De l'autre côté des Pyrénées les Basques disent aussi *arrocher*—rocher. Cependant ils préfixent plus volontiers l'*e*—*errisina*, resine, *erabia*, rage. Peut-être en bien cherchant trouvera-t-on quelques mots où ces préfixes *a* et *e* seraient remplacés par *i*. Aussi selon les pays, viz.: se dit *arrosa* ou *irrisa*." We do not see how we can reconcile Prof. Campbell's constant use of the *R* with the plain testimony of these eminent Basque scholars.

From the first page to the last of "Etruria Capta." any affinity between languages is based on mere similarity of sound. Prof. Campbell never once points to any similarity in grammatical forms; yet it is on this alone that any such affinity can be proved. Nay, he even makes a virtue of his rejection of grammatical forms, and he says: "I have set forth the fact that, various as are the grammatical forms of Basque, Caucasian, Yeniseian, Japanese, Corean, Iroquois, Chocktaw, and Aztec, they are one in vocabulary, and constitute with many other members a linguistic family of no small importance. The parent speech belongs to Syria. West of Syria, in Asia Minor, Italy, Spain, and Britain, the inscriptions yield Basque." We think we have shown how far Prof. Campbell is competent to speak of this. He continues: "East of Syria, in India, Siberia and on this continent, the Japanese at first, and afterwards the Aztec, are the languages set forth." And again: "The threefold Tyrseni, Tuscer, Naharcer, Japuscer, carry us back to Mesopotamia, the land of Nairi or Nahirina, and to the region of Khupuscai, as well as forward to Navarre and Guipuscoa. The former even takes us to this continent, where the Aztecs or Citin also called themselves Nahuatl or Navetl. Who the Tuscer were it is harder to say, for the final *er* is a termination; otherwise the great Basque name *Euskara* would at once suggest itself

in such a form as the Dioscurias of Colchis, now Iskurieh, near which Chapsoukes or modern Khupuscians and eastern Guipuscoans dwelt." It is hard to characterize this. It is simply philology run mad. Euskara and Dioscurias connected! Prof. Campbell knows Greek, and should know that the cities which bore the name of Dioscurias, and of which there were several, received that name because they honoured as their tutelary Deities, the twin sons of Leda, Castor and Pollux, the Dioskouroi.

Perhaps the leading error into which Prof. Campbell falls is the constant application of the laws which govern the Aryan languages to the Turanian also. Grimm's laws, of the variations of consonants in the Aryan languages, do not hold good in the Turanian. But even in Aryan languages, it is always dangerous to conclude that words which assimilate in sound, or that have the same class of consonants, are connected, and much less may such assimilation be trusted in the Turanian languages. Rask, Schott, Castrén, Rémusat, and Boetlingk,—in fact all who have written on the Turanian languages, are very particular in guarding us against depending on the similarity in sound. But they also tell us that it is absurd to expect the existence of the same words running through the Turanian languages as they do in the Aryan. The Turanian languages have not been thoroughly classified, and the difficulty lies not only in the variation of grammatical forms, but quite as much in the vocabulary. Speaking generally, the Turanian nations have had no literature to fix words, and the consequence is that they differ from one another to a degree of which the Aryan scholar has no idea, and which makes it impossible to compare them in the very loose way Prof. Campbell has attempted. The basis of the classification of the Turanian languages has hitherto been according to the employment of pronominal affixes, but this is an unsatisfactory and very meagre mode of arriving at a classification. Max Müller says: "To maintain a word and not to allow it to be replaced by a new expression was possible in the Aryan, that is in a social state of the language, not among nomad tribes, who, living only for the present, were little concerned about the past or future, without history, without ambition; and thus we find that the number of common words is very small." Schott says: "We ought not to despair about the affinity of these languages, the Turanian, although the words for the most necessary ideas in them are so essentially different." To Prof. Campbell, however, the Turanian languages

present no difficulty whatever, and he proves their affinity with one another by long lists of words, which he says are identical in Basque and Etruscan, in Japanese and Circassian, in Hittite and Chooklaw, in Iroquois and Aztec. We trust Prof. Campbell will pardon us if we prefer the judgment of Müller and Schott, and of a score of other Turanian scholars to his judgment, and if we express a very strong doubt as to the value of his researches and his very remarkable conclusions.

And now a few words regarding the Etruscan alphabet, its origin, some of its peculiarities, and the extent of country over which it prevailed, and a short statement of what is generally received concerning the origin of the Etruscans. The town of Chalcis in Eubœa was one of the oldest of the Phœnician colonies, and received from Phœnicia the alphabet, which it adopted with very little change. When Chalcis became an Ionic possession it still retained its alphabet, which is more closely connected with the old Phœnician than any other of the Greek alphabets. Shortly after Chalcis became Ionic it entered into rivalry with Miletus for commercial and colonial supremacy. Miletus acquired a supremacy in Eastern Europe, in the *Ægean*, and the Euxine; while Chalcis turned to Italy and the West. Cumæ was founded by a colony from Chalcis, and became a centre from which Greek learning, Greek culture, and the Greek Chalcidian alphabet were communicated to the rest of Italy. Etruria early received its alphabet from this source and an examination of the Etruscan letters will at once show their similarity with that earliest Greek alphabet. The Etruscan, the Umbrian and the Oscan of the Italian dialects approach most nearly in their alphabets to the Chalcidian, and the Latin is the farthest removed. The Etruscan rejects the soft mutes B, G, D, and retains the aspirates *th*, *ph*, *ch*. The Latin on the other hand retains the soft mutes and rejects the aspirates. The Etruscan and the Umbrian alike retain the Sam and the Sigma, the Zain and Samekh of the Phœnicians. At that early period we perhaps cannot expect exact fixity in the alphabet, and while all the Etruscan inscriptions are of the same type, there are yet some minor differences, as we may see by comparing the pure Etruscan alphabet with the Etruscan alphabet of Campania. This last lying close to the Oscan, seems to have been affected by it. The influence of the Etruscans was very great in the South, but especially so in the north of Italy, and even in the districts still further north. They carried on commerce with

central Europe, and apparently with the countries around the Baltic. Northern wares are frequently found in the tombs, and were also exported from Tarquinii, a seaport which rivalled Massilia in the amount of its exports. The result was that the Etruscan alphabet extended far into Europe, and from the *Romana Provincia* on the west to the Tyrol and Carinthia on the east. Throughout this extended district the Etruscan alphabet prevailed. But in the north-eastern corner of Italy another element was introduced and another Greek alphabet. That movement which drove the Dorians out of Thessaly to the south seems to have compelled the migration of another tribe into north Italy, and this tribe settled about the mouths of the Po and the Adige. Whether these were Veneti or the Euganei, we are not prepared to say. The inscriptions in this alphabet are found principally at Este. With which of the Greek alphabets we are to connect it is still uncertain. Berndorf believes it to be Ionic; Kirchhoff regards it as Locrian; while the Bronze of Tegea would seem to connect it with the Arcadian or the Elean.

And now, before we close, a few words regarding the origin of the Etruscans. Herodotus tells us that the Lydian nation having, from internal difficulties, become divided, one portion emigrated from Lydia under Tyrrhenus, or as he is some times called Tarchon, and that after a time these emigrants settled in Umbria, and by Umbria Herodotus means North Italy. Whatever importance we may attach to this story it must be admitted that there are some facts which seem to lend it plausibility. The sea which washes the west coast of Etruria has, from an early period, been called the Tyrrhenian Sea, and the city of Tarquinii is regarded as having derived its name from Tarchon. That a band of pirates called Tyrrhenians did long infest the Ægean Sea is well attested, and it seems equally certain that a portion of them settled in Italy. Thucydides speaks of Tyrrhenian-Pelasgians who had originally dwelt in the peninsula of Athos, but were driven from there to Athens or Attica, and finally took refuge in Lemnos. Herodotus adds that these Tyrrhenians drove out the Minyae and held the island for some time but were overpowered by Otanes, a general of Darius Hystaspes. After the close of the Persian wars the Athenians took possession of the island. Both ancient and modern writers identify these Tyrrhenians with the Tyrrhenian invaders of Italy. Niebuhr was the first to point out that the Etruscan was a mixed language, and

Lepsius believes that with a strong Pelasgic element there is combined an Umbrian and possibly a Greek. Without entering into any discussion of these opinions we notice that the identification of the Tyrrhenians of Lemnos with the Tyrrhenians or Etruscans of Italy has been confirmed by the recent discovery on the island of Lemnos of two inscriptions in unmistakable Etruscan. These inscriptions, which seem of different dates, are engraved on two sides of a large block of stone, which evidently formed part of an altar. As read, the altar is called the Altar of the Hephaestii, and is dedicated to Zerona, worshipped in Myrina. Hephaestias and Myrina were the two principal towns on the Island. This deity, Zerona of the Tyrrhenians of Lemnos, suggests a connection with the Zirne of the Etruscans, and the Macedonian Zeirele, and, perhaps, with the Thracian Zarunthos, -thos being a masculine termination. These similarities would seem to identify the Tyrrhenian-Pelasgians of Etruria with the Pelasgians of Greece. But there is satisfactory evidence connecting this stone with the place where it was found. It bears the names of the two towns of the island, and is dedicated to the tutelar Deity of one of these towns, and it must be remembered that the dedication is in the Etruscan language. This new discovery certainly corroborates the information given by Herodotus, by Thucydides, Hellanicus, Plutarch and Strabo. But perhaps this new discovery does not determine very much, for the question will be asked: Who were these Tyrrhenian-Pelasgians? But this discovery will have the effect of pointing out more definitely in what direction researches ought to be pushed, while it renders more probable the finding of some bilingual which may furnish the key to unlock the Etruscan mystery. It does not as yet permit any new solution of the Etruscan problem, it only gives hope of some further light on the subject.

